

REMARKS

Claims 1-15, all the claims pending in the application, stand rejected on prior art grounds. Moreover, the drawings are objected to. Claims 1-6 and 10-15 are amended herein. Claims 16-20 are newly added herein. Moreover, the specification is amended herein. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

I. The Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to because they include reference characters not mentioned in the specification. Accordingly, the Applicants have amended the specification to properly refer to all of the reference characters in the drawings, and more particularly, reference characters 100, 105, 110, 400, and 435. These reference characters were inadvertently left out of the specification as originally filed, or, as in the case of reference characters 100, 105, and 110, were mistakenly referred to as different reference characters, namely 200, 205, and 210, respectively. Accordingly, the specification has been amended to overcome this objection. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw these objections.

II. The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Dayal et al. (“Active Database Systems,” Sept. 1994), hereinafter referred to as “Dayal”. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion. Dayal teaches integrating a production rules facility into a database system and provides a uniform mechanism for a number of advanced database features including integrity constraint enforcement, derived data maintenance, triggers, alerters, protection, version control, and others. In addition, Dayal

teaches that a database system with rule processing capabilities provides a useful platform for large and efficient knowledge-base and expert systems.

However, the Applicants' claimed invention, as provided in amended independent claims 1 and 13-15 contain features, which are patentably distinguishable from Dayal. Specifically, claims 1 and 13-15 recite, in part, "...registering alarms associated with a start and end of a lifespan of each temporal event; selectively deploying and selectively permanently removing the temporal events from said database based upon the changed temporal constraints; and upon reaching said end of said lifespan of said each temporal event, permanently removing from said database said alarm associated with the permanently removed temporal event." These features are neither taught or suggested in Dayal because in Dayal the temporal events are not physically completely removed from the database. Rather, Section 2, Page 3, Paragraph 3 of Dayal merely states that:

Like any object, rules can be created, deleted, or modified. In addition, rule objects have some special operations, including: **fire**, which causes a rule to be triggered; **enable**, which causes a rule to be activated; **disable**, which causes a rule to be deactivated (so that it won't be triggered even if its triggering event occurs).

The above language of Dayal makes clear that the rules that are disabled are merely deactivated, but are not permanently removed (or deleted) from the database. This is abundantly clear because Dayal indicates that the deactivated rule is merely not triggered when it becomes disabled, which indicates that the deactivated rule still remains on the database; it simply is not triggered when disabled.

This is different from the Applicants' claimed invention, which permanently removes the temporal events and corresponding alarms from the database based upon the changed temporal constraints. Hence, in the Applicants' claimed invention a deactivated rule will not be triggered

because it will not exist on the database, whereas in Dayal, a deactivated rule will not trigger because it is merely disabled (but still exists on the database and consumes processing resources nonetheless). This is a significant and patentable difference between the Applicants' claimed invention and Dayal because by permanently removing the triggers from the database significantly increases the overall system efficiency, thereby improving the overall system performance including system response time (as indicated in the Applicants' Figs. 7-9).

Furthermore, there is nothing in Dayal that suggests incorporating alarms associated with a start and end of a lifespan of each temporal event, as the Applicants' claimed invention provides. Accordingly, Dayal is missing at least one element that the Applicants' claimed invention clearly provides, which under 35 U.S.C. §102 renders the Applicants' claimed invention patentable over Dayal. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Dayal does not teach or suggest the features defined by amended independent claims 1 and 13-15 and as such, claims 1 and 13-15 are patentable over Dayal. Further, dependent claims 2-12 and newly added claims 16-20 are similarly patentable over Dayal, not only by virtue of their dependency from patentable independent claims, respectively, but also by virtue of the additional features of the invention they define. Moreover, the Applicants note that all claims are properly supported in the specification and accompanying drawings. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

III. Formal Matters and Conclusion

With respect to the objections to the drawings and rejections to the claims, the specification and claims have been amended, above, to overcome these objections and rejections. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the

objections to the drawings and rejections to the claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-20, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,


Mohammad S. Rahman
Registration No. 43,029

Dated: July 28, 2006

Gibb I.P. Law Firm, LLC
2568-A Riva Road, Suite 304
Annapolis, MD 21401
Voice: (301) 261-8625
Fax: (301) 261-8825
Customer Number: 29154